

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18, 24 and 25 are present in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10 and 11 have been amended, claims 19-23 have been canceled, and claims 24 and 25 have been added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicant acknowledges the election of Group I, claims 1-18, without traverse.

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended herein to more clearly define structural relationships between the claimed components. In particular, claim 1 defines a saw and track manipulator fixable to the aerial work platform. The saw and track manipulator supports the track and saw and enables positioning of the track and saw. The hydraulic power source is controllable from the aerial work platform and provides hydraulic power and coolant flow to the wall saw. Claim 9 has been amended in a similar manner.

With regard to the use of “saw/track,” without conceding this rejection, the claims have been amended to define a “saw and track” manipulator.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,832,412 to Bertrand in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,998,775 to Hollifield. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that neither Bertrand nor Hollifield disclose structure for manipulating a wall saw; nor does either patent even remotely relate to an accessory for an aerial work platform. In this context, independent claims 1 and 9 tie in the aerial work platform with

the claimed components, defining a saw and track manipulator fixable to the aerial work platform . . . , and a hydraulic power source controllable from the aerial work platform In addition, both Bertrand and Hollifield describe systems for cutting generally horizontal surfaces. An accessory for supporting a wall saw and corresponding track is necessarily required to overcome numerous considerations that are of no concern to a saw unit operable on a road or floor. These considerations are thus lacking in Bertrand and Hollifield. Claim 1, for example, references a wall saw movably affixed on a track secured to a wall. The manipulator effects positioning of the saw and track to and from a working position [on the wall]. Neither Bertrand nor Hollifield discloses such structure, and Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons, the rejection is misplaced.

Moreover, Bertrand discloses a manipulator that is intended to position and control the saw and track during a cutting operation. In contrast, the accessory and aerial work platform of the invention are detachable from the saw and track during operation (i.e., “in the working position”). See, for example, paragraph [0027]. In an effort to clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the saw and track manipulator is detachable from the saw and track in the working position. Claim 9 has been similarly amended.

An important advantage of the present invention over the Bertrand and Hollifield devices is that an operator on the aerial work platform can control the operation of the wall saw after securing the wall saw and track to a wall. In this manner, after a cut is complete, the wall saw and track can be moved to another cutting position without requiring the operator to leave the platform. In this context, claims 1 and 9 have been further amended to recite that the hydraulic power source is “controllable from the aerial work platform” This subject matter is also

lacking in Bertrand and Hollifield, and for this reason also, Applicant submits that the rejection is misplaced.

With respect to dependent claims 3, 11 and 16-18, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Moreover, claim 18 recites that the hydraulic power source comprises a hydraulic pump used to power a drive system of the lift vehicle. In this manner, the aerial work platform is not used merely as a carrier. Rather, the saw and machine are fully integrated, including power and control systems. Neither Bertrand nor Hollifield discloses this subject matter.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bertrand in view of Hollifield and U.S. Patent No. 6,863,062 to Denys. The Denys patent, however, does not correct the deficiencies noted above with regard to Bertrand and Hollifield. As such, Applicant submits that claims 4, 5 and 12 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 6, 10 and 13. Claims 2 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form.

Claims 24 and 25 have been added, reciting that the hydraulic power source is controllable from the aerial work platform via a control unit attachable to the aerial work platform. This subject matter is disclosed in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0024] and Fig. 1. This feature of the invention is also lacking in the applied references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the

KOBEL
Appl. No. 10/802,917
September 2, 2005

application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Alan M. Kagen
Alan M. Kagen
Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100